arXiv:1110.3768v1 [math.DG] 17 Oct 2011

Stable Higgs bundles and Hermitian-Einstein metrics on non-Kähler manifolds

Adam Jacob

Abstract

If X is a compact Gauduchon manifold, we show that for a stable Higgs bundle over X, the Donaldson heat flow converges along a subsequence of times to a Hermitian-Einstein connection. This allows us to extend to the non-Kähler case the correspondence between stable Higgs bundles and Hermitian-Einstein connections first proven by Simpson on Kähler manifolds.

1 Introduction

Given a holomorphic vector bundle E over a complex manifold X, a natural question is whether it admits a Hermitian-Einstein metric. This question has rich history, and the fundamental theorem is that a Hermitian-Einstein metric exists if and only if E is stable. This was first proven by Narasimhan and Seshadri in the case of curves [16], then for algebraic surfaces by Donaldson [7], and for higher dimensional compact Kähler manifolds by Uhlenbeck and Yau [21]. Buchdahl extended Donaldson's result to arbitrary compact complex surfaces in [3], and Li and Yau generalized Uhlenbeck and Yau's theorem to any compact complex Hermitian manifold in [13]. In all cases, the stability we consider is the slope stability of Mumford-Takemoto, and E is stable if for every proper coherent subsheaf $\mathcal{F} \subset E$:

$$\mu(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{deg(\mathcal{F})}{rk(\mathcal{F})} < \frac{deg(E)}{rk(E)} = \mu(E).$$

There are many generalizations of this result, including to the case of Higgs bundles by Simpson in [18]. We briefly review his result here. Let X be a compact Kähler manifold with volume one. A Higgs bundle is a vector bundle E, together with an endomorphism valued one form:

$$\theta : E \longrightarrow \Lambda^{1,0}(E),$$

which we call the Higgs field. If $\theta^\dagger$ is the adjoint of θ with respect to H, and if ∇ is the usual unitary-Chern connection on E, we can define a new connection $D := \nabla + \theta + \theta^\dagger$, and try to solve the Hermitian-Einstein problem:

$$\Lambda F_\theta = \mu(E)I, \tag{1.1}$$

where here F_θ is the curvature of D. This leads to solutions of Hermitian-Einstein equation without the restriction that the connection be unitary. Now, given the extra assumption that θ be holomorphic and $\theta \wedge \theta = 0$, Simpson was able to construct a solution to (1.1) in the case that E is stable. Here stability is defined as before, with the restriction that each subsheaf $\mathcal{F}$ be preserved by the Higgs field.

The goal of this paper is to generalize Simpson's result to the case where X is not Kähler. We state our full result here:

Theorem 1. *Let X be a compact, complex Hermitian manifold, and let E be an irreducible Higgs bundle over X. Assume the Higgs field is holomorphic and satisfies the integrability condition $\theta \wedge \theta = 0$. Then there exists a Gauduchon metric g on X such that a solution to* (1.1) *exists if and only if E is stable.*

A Gauduchon metric is a generalization of a Kähler metric, and while Kähler metrics may not always exists, there exists a Gauduchon metric on all compact Hermitian manifolds. We note that with the two stated assumptions on the Higgs field, the curvature F_θ of D takes a special form, and (1.1) reduces to solving:

$$\Lambda F - \mu(E)I = g^{j\bar{k}}[\theta^\dagger_{\bar{k}}, \theta_j],$$

where here F is the curvature of ∇. In this form we can see how this equation generalizes the original Hermitian-Einstein equation. Of course, assuming that θ is holomorphic and $\theta \wedge \theta = 0$ may seem arbitrary, yet in certain cases these assumptions do arise naturally from the geometry of E. Specifically, if $c_1(E) = c_2(E) \cdot [\omega]^{n-2} = 0$, then any connection D which satisfies (1.1) must be flat, and in this case we say D is stable if E admits no non-trivial D-invariant subbundles. Then if X is Kähler, using the existence of harmonic metrics ([4], [6], [9]), and a Bochner type formula of Siu [20] and Sampson [17], it follows that if D is stable than $\bar{\partial}\theta = \theta \wedge \theta = 0$ (for details see [5]). Thus these two assumptions arise naturally from stability and equation (1.1). Of course, this argument uses that X is Kähler in a fundamental way, and it would be interesting to know if the corresponding statement that D stable implies $\bar{\partial}\theta = \theta \wedge \theta = 0$ is true in the non-Kähler case.

We prove Theorem 1 by following the parabolic approach used by Donaldson [7] and Simpson [18]. The main idea is to define a non-linear heat flow on the space of metrics:

$$H^{-1}\dot{H} = -(\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I), \tag{1.2}$$

and show that along a subsequence of times a solution of this flow converges to a solution of (1.1). Aside from having to be careful with torsion terms after integrating by parts, a surprising number of difficulties arise when X is not Kähler. The most striking is that the evolution equation (1.2) is not the gradient flow of any functional. Both Simpson and Donaldson rely heavily on the fact that in the Kähler case there exists a funtional $M(H_0, H)$ such that (1.2) is the gradient flow. Thus we must modify our proof substantially to get around this difficulty. The first place this comes up is in showing a C^0 bound for H along the flow. In our case we cannot follow Simpson's proof, so we adapt the elliptic C^0 estimate of Uhlenbeck and Yau to our parabolic setting. The second difficulty that arrises is in showing that ΛF_θ converges to $\mu(E)I$ in L^2, an important step in the exposition of [19]. Instead we must compute the variation of M in the Gauduchon case, and show that the extra terms we get are in fact bounded by terms we can control, and achieve L^2 convergence in this fashion.

Here we note that because in [13] Li and Yau follow the elliptic approach of the method of continuity, our result provides the first heat flow proof of the Hermitian-Einstein problem in the non-Kähler case. We consider this approach a worthwhile investigation in that we have developed techniques for using geometic flows in this more general setting. Now, it was shown by Biswas in [2] that the correspondence between stable Higgs bundles and representations of the fundamental group for compact Kähler manifolds does not extend to the non-Kähler case, which is a main corollary of Simpson's work in the Kähler case [18]. However, we hope the existence of Hermitian-Einstein metrics on Higgs bundles in our setting will provide insight into other geometric problems in non-Kähler geometry.

We divide up the paper in following way. Section 2 contains the general background information. We derive formulas for curvature, introduce Higgs bundles and stability, and prove some basic properties of both Gauduchon and semi-Kähler metrics. In Section 3 we introduce the Donaldson heat flow and the Donaldson functional, and describe the evolution of certain key quantities. Section 4 contains the proof of our main result under the assumption that H is bounded in the C^0 norm along the flow. Finally in Section 5 we show how to achieve the C^0 bound for H using the stability of E.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, the author would like to thank his thesis advisor, D.H. Phong, for all his guidance and support during the process of writing this paper. The author also thanks Valentino Tosatti and Gabor Székelyhidi for much encouragement and some helpful suggestions. This research was funded in part by the National Science Foundation, Grant No. DMS-07-57372. The results of this paper are part of the author's forthcoming Ph.D. thesis at Columbia University.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Higgs bundles

Let X be a compact Hermitian manifold of complex dimension n. Let g be a Hermitian metric on the holomorphic tangent bundle $T^{1,0}X$. Associated to g we have the following fundamental (1,1)-form:

$$\omega = \frac{i}{2} g_{\bar{k}j} dz^j \wedge d\bar{z}^k.$$

In this paper, X will always be compact, and its volume is given by:

$$Vol(X) := \int_X \frac{\omega^n}{n!}.$$

We say g is Gauduchon if $\partial\bar{\partial}(\omega^{n-1}) = 0$, semi-Kähler if $d(\omega^{n-1}) = 0$, and Kähler if $d(\omega) = 0$. Let Λ denote the adjoint of wedging with ω. If ψ is a $(1,1)$ form, then $\Lambda\psi$

is a smooth function locally given by $\Lambda\psi = g^{l\bar{m}}\psi_{\bar{m}l}$. Furthermore, we have the following relation:

$$\psi \wedge \omega^{n-1} = (\Lambda\psi)\omega^n. \tag{2.3}$$

Here we have used, for notational simplicity, the convention that ω^n stands for $\omega^n/n!$ and ω^{n-1} stands for $\omega^{n-1}/n-1!$. We assume this throughout the paper.

Let E be a holomorphic vector bundle over X of rank r. Given a metric H on E, we define the unitary-Chern connection as follows:

$$\nabla_{\bar{k}}s^\alpha = \partial_{\bar{k}}s^\alpha \qquad \nabla_j s^\alpha = \partial_j s^\alpha + H^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}\partial_j H_{\bar{\beta}\gamma}s^\gamma,$$

where s is a section of E. We denote $A^\alpha_{j\gamma} = H^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}\partial_j H_{\bar{\beta}\gamma}$. This connection can also be expressed in terms of forms. Let $\nabla = \bar{\partial} + \partial_A$ be the covariant differential defined by:

$$\bar{\partial}s = \nabla_{\bar{k}}s^\alpha d\bar{z}^k \qquad \partial_A s = \nabla_j s^\alpha dz^j.$$

The curvature of the unitary-Chern connection is a endomorphism valued two from given by $F_{\bar{k}j}{}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta} = -\partial_{\bar{k}}(H^{\alpha\bar{\gamma}}\partial_j H_{\bar{\gamma}\beta})$.

We say E is a *Higgs bundle* if there exists a holomorphic map $\theta : E \longrightarrow \Lambda^{1,0}(E)$, which we call the *Higgs field*. Given a metric H on E, let $\theta^\dagger$ be the adjoint of θ with respect to H. In a local frame $\theta^\dagger$ is given by $\theta^{\dagger\alpha}{}_{\rho} = H^{\alpha\bar{\beta}}\overline{\theta^{\gamma}{}_{\beta}}H_{\bar{\gamma}\rho}$. We can now consider the following connection on E:

$$D = \nabla + \theta + \theta^\dagger.$$

Let F_θ denote the curvature of D. If F is the curvature of ∇, and $\theta \wedge \theta = 0$, we can express F_θ as follows:

$$F_\theta = F + \partial_A\theta + \bar{\partial}\theta^\dagger + \theta \wedge \theta^\dagger + \theta^\dagger \wedge \theta.$$

Now, by formula (2.3) we have $F_\theta \wedge \omega^{n-1} = \Lambda F_\theta\, \omega^n$. Because $\partial_A\theta$ is a $(2,0)$-form and $\bar{\partial}\theta^\dagger$ a $(0,2)$-form, it follows that $(\partial_A\theta + \bar{\partial}\theta^\dagger) \wedge \omega^{n-1} = 0$. Thus, in local coordinates ΛF_θ is given by:

$$\Lambda F_\theta = \Lambda F - g^{j\bar{k}}[\theta^\dagger_{\bar{k}}, \theta_j].$$

The connection D can be broken into two parts $D = D' + D''$, defined by:

$$D' = \partial_A + \theta^\dagger \qquad \text{and} \qquad D'' = \bar{\partial} + \theta.$$

We note that this is *not* the usual decomposition of a connection into $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ parts. However, this decomposition has the feature that if the metric $H(t)$ on E is evolving with time, D' evolves as well, yet D'' remains fixed. This fact turns out to be extremely important in proving many useful formulas need in later sections. Also, because of the assumptions that θ is holomorphic and $\theta \wedge \theta = 0$, we see that $(D'')^2 = (D')^2 = 0$, thus using this decomposition we have:

$$F_\theta = D' \circ D'' + D'' \circ D'.$$

This fact proves useful in later sections as well.

Here we define our notion of stability, which was considered by Simpson in [18]. Given a vector bundle E with metric H, we define its degree as:

$$deg(E) = \int_X \mathrm{Tr}(F_\theta) \wedge \omega^{n-1}.$$

Of course we would get the same degree if we used the curvature of unitary-Chern connection ∇ in our definition as opposed to D. However, for the purposes of our paper it will be more useful to consider D. Note that g Gauduchon is the minimum assumption we need for degree to be well defined. That is, given a different metric $\hat{H}$ on E, there is a smooth function ψ so that difference $\mathrm{Tr}(F_\theta) \wedge \omega^{n-1} - \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{F}_\theta) \wedge \omega^{n-1} = \partial\bar{\partial}\psi \wedge \omega^{n-1}$, which integrates to zero in the Gauduchon case.

Consider a proper torsion free subsheaf $\mathcal{F} \subset E$ with torsion free quotient. We say $\mathcal{F}$ is a *sub-Higgs sheaf* of E if θ preserves $\mathcal{F}$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is a vector bundle off a singular set $Z(\mathcal{F})$ of codimension 2, off this set we can consider the orthogonal projection $\pi : E \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}$. Let ϕ be a section of $\mathcal{F}$. The connection D induces a connection on $\mathcal{F}$, which is given by $D_{\mathcal{F}}(\phi) = \pi \circ D(\phi)$. The second fundamental form associated to this connection is defined by:

$$(D - D_{\mathcal{F}})\phi = (I - \pi)D\phi.$$

Because both $\bar{\partial}$ and θ preserve $\mathcal{F}$, we know $(I - \pi) \circ D'' = 0$, so the second fundamental form can in fact be expressed $(I - \pi)D'\phi$. We also compute:

$$D'(\pi)\phi = D'(\pi\phi) - \pi D'(\phi) = (I - \pi)D'\phi,$$

Thus $D'(\pi)$ represents the second fundamental form associated to D. Now, using how curvature decomposes onto subbundles (see [11]), we have:

$$F_\theta^{\mathcal{F}} = \pi F_\theta \pi - D''(\pi) \wedge D'(\pi).$$

Although this formula only holds on $X \backslash Z(\mathcal{F})$, by [10] we know induced curvature is at least in L^1, and since $Z(\mathcal{F})$ has zero measure the degree of $\mathcal{F}$ can once again be defined by integrating over X:

$$deg(\mathcal{F}) = \int_X \mathrm{Tr}(\pi F_\theta) \wedge \omega^{n-1} - ||D'\pi||^2_{L^2}.$$

This is the well know Chern-Weil formula. The slope of a sheaf $\mu(\mathcal{F})$ is the quotient of the degree of $\mathcal{F}$ by the rank of $\mathcal{F}$. We say E is stable if, given any proper coherent sub-Higgs sheaf $\mathcal{F}$, we have $\mu(\mathcal{F}) < \mu(E)$. This is the stability condition we need in order to solve our equation 1.1.

2.2 Gauduchon and semi-Kähler assumptions

In this subsection we explore the intricacies of our non-Kähler setting. If X is compact Hermitian manifold with metric g_0 on $T^{1,0}X$, then there exists a smooth function ψ so that $e^{\psi}g_0$ is Gauduchon [14]. Thus the assumption that X admit a Gauduchon metric is completely general, as opposed to the existence of Kähler or semi-Kähler, which may not always exist. Because we will mostly compute in local coordinates, we will derive here coordinate versions of the Gauduchon and semi-Kähler conditions.

The torsion tensor T is defined by the relation

$$T_{l\bar{k}j} = \partial_l g_{\bar{k}j} - \partial_j g_{\bar{k}l}.$$

Note T vanishes on Kähler manifolds. We will need to compute the derivative of the inverse metric times the volume form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{\bar{k}}(g^{p\bar{k}}\omega^n) &= -g^{p\bar{m}}\partial_{\bar{k}} g_{\bar{m}l} g^{l\bar{k}}\omega^n + g^{p\bar{k}}\partial_{\bar{k}} g_{\bar{q}l} g^{l\bar{q}}\omega^n. \\
&= g^{p\bar{k}}\overline{T_{k\bar{l}q}}\, g^{l\bar{q}}\omega^n \\
&= g^{p\bar{k}}\overline{T_k{}^q{}_q}\,\omega^n.
\end{aligned}$$

This will be useful in the following computations. Let $\star$ be the Hodge star operator. We have the following two lemmas:

Lemma 1. *For any* $(0,1)$ *form* ψ*, we have the following identity:*

$$\psi_{\bar{j}} g^{k\bar{j}} T_k{}^p{}_p = i\star(\partial(\omega^{n-1})\wedge\psi_{\bar{p}}\,d\bar{z}^p).$$

Proof. Let $\phi\in\mathbf{C}^{\infty}(X)$, $\psi\in\Lambda^{0,1}(X)$, and let $(\cdot,\cdot)$ be the L^2 inner product on differential forms over X. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\phi, i\star(\partial(\omega^{n-1})\wedge\psi_{\bar{p}}\,d\bar{z}^p)) &= \int_X \phi\wedge\star\overline{i\star(\partial(\omega^{n-1})\wedge\psi_{\bar{p}}\,d\bar{z}^p)} \\
&= -i\int_X \phi(-1)^{2n}\overline{\partial(\omega^{n-1})\wedge\psi} \\
&= i\int_X \bar{\partial}(\phi\overline{\psi})\wedge\omega^{n-1} \\
&= -\int_X g^{j\bar{k}}\partial_{\bar{k}}(\phi\overline{\psi_{\bar{j}}})\omega^n,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from equation (2.3). We integrate by parts again and see:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\int_X g^{j\bar{k}}\partial_{\bar{k}}(\phi\overline{\psi_{\bar{j}}})\omega^n &= \int_X \phi\,\overline{\psi_{\bar{j}}\partial_k(g^{k\bar{j}}\omega^n)} \\
&= \int_X \phi\,\overline{\psi_{\bar{j}} g^{k\bar{j}} T_k{}^p{}_p}\,\omega^n \\
&= (\phi, \psi_{\bar{j}} g^{k\bar{j}} T_k{}^p{}_p),
\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of the lemma. ☐

Lemma 2. *The following identity holds on all compact Hermitian manifolds:*

$$-i \star (\partial\bar{\partial}\omega^{n-1}) = \nabla^k T_k{}^m{}_m + g^{k\bar{j}} T_k{}^m{}_m \overline{T_j{}^p{}_p}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the previous lemma. We integrate by parts twice, apply formula (2.3), and integrate by parts twice again. ☐

We now have the following corollaries, which we will use throughout the paper to take advantage of our assumptions on g.

Corollary 1. *If g is semi-Kähler, then for any $(0,1)$ form ψ, we have $\psi_{\bar{j}} g^{k\bar{j}} T_k{}^p{}_p = 0$.*

Corollary 2. *If g is Gauduchon, then $\nabla^k T_k{}^m{}_m + g^{k\bar{j}} T_k{}^m{}_m \overline{T_j{}^p{}_p} = 0$.*

Here we note that semi-Kähler condition is the minimum assumption we need to integrate by parts without torsion terms. To see this, let $f \in C^\infty(X)$ and $\phi \in \Lambda^{1,0}(X)$. Then if ω is semi-Kähler we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_X g^{j\bar{k}} \nabla_{\bar{k}} f \phi_j \, \omega^n &= -\int_X f \nabla_{\bar{k}} (\phi_j \, g^{j\bar{k}} \omega^n) \\
&= -\int_X f \nabla_{\bar{k}} \phi_j \, g^{j\bar{k}} \omega^n - \int_X f \phi_j \, \nabla_{\bar{k}} (g^{j\bar{k}} \omega^n) \\
&= -\int_X f \nabla_{\bar{k}} \phi_j \, g^{j\bar{k}} \omega^n - \int_X f \phi_j \, g^{j\bar{k}} \overline{T_k{}^p{}_p} \omega^n.
\end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right vanishes by Corollary 1.

3 The Donaldson heat flow

In this section we introduce the Donaldson heat heat flow on Higgs bundles. For an initial metric H_0, we define the flow of endomorphsims $h = h(t)$ by:

$$h^{-1}\dot{h} = -(\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E) I), \tag{3.4}$$

where $h(0) = I$ and $F_\theta = F_\theta(t)$ is the curvature of the metric $H(t) = H_0 h(t)$. The goal of this paper is to show the flow converges to a solution of (1.1) along a subsequence of times. First we compute the evolution of a few key terms, which we will need for later sections. Let $\hat{A}$ be the unitary Chern connection associated to the fixed metric H_0. We denote all other terms associated to H_0 in a similar fashion. The following formula relates the two unitary-Chern connections:

$$A - \hat{A} = \partial_A h h^{-1}.$$

Note we also have

$$\theta^\dagger(h) h^{-1} = \theta^\dagger h h^{-1} - h \theta^\dagger h^{-1} = \theta^\dagger - \hat{\theta}^\dagger.$$

Thus $(A+\theta^\dagger)-(\hat{A}+\hat{\theta}^\dagger)=D'hh^{-1}$. Now, recall the difference between the two unitary-Chern curvature tensors:

$$F-\hat{F}=\bar{\partial}(\partial_A h h^{-1}).$$

In fact, we have a corresponding formula for the curvature of D. We compute:

$$D''(D'hh^{-1})=\bar{\partial}(A-\hat{A}+\theta^\dagger-\hat{\theta}^\dagger)+\theta(A-\hat{A}+\theta^\dagger-\hat{\theta}^\dagger)=F_t-\hat{F}_\theta. \tag{3.5}$$

Of course, deriving these formula's using h^{-1} instead of h, we also get the corresponding formula involving the covariant derivative with respect to H_0:

$$F_\theta-\hat{F}_\theta=D''(h^{-1}\hat{D}'h). \tag{3.6}$$

We now use these formulas to help compute the evolution equations for key terms along the flow. From [19], we have that along any path of endomorphisms $h(t)$, the unitary-Chern connection evolves by $\partial_t(A)=\partial_t(\partial_A h\, h^{-1})=\partial_A(h^{-1}\dot{h})$. Also, by the definition of adjoint we have $\partial_t(\theta^\dagger)=\theta^\dagger h^{-1}\dot{h}-h^{-1}\dot{h}\theta^\dagger$. Thus $\partial_t(D'hh^{-1})=D'(h^{-1}\dot{h})$. We can now compute how curvature evolves with time:

$$\dot{F}_\theta=\partial_t D''(D'h\,h^{-1})=D''D'(h^{-1}\dot{h})=-D''D'(\Lambda F_\theta).$$

From this equation we also see how the trace of the curvature evolves:

$$\Lambda\dot{F}_\theta=g^{j\bar{k}}D''_{\bar{k}}D'_j(\Lambda F_\theta)=\overline{\Delta}_D(\Lambda F_\theta)=\Delta_D(\Lambda F_\theta),$$

since in this special case, $\overline{\Delta}_D=\Delta_D$. Here Δ_D is an elliptic operator, so as an immediate consequence of the last formula, by the maximum principle we have:

$$\sup_X|\Lambda F_\theta(t)|<C, \tag{3.7}$$

uniformly in time. We will need the following lemma:

Lemma 3. *We can pick an initial metric on E so that $det(h)=1$ for all time along the flow.*

Proof. Let K be a fixed metric on E. We want to find a function ϕ so that $H_0=e^\phi K$ will satisfy $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)=0$. Following [15], we compute out how the conformal change effects the curvature of the unitary-Chern connection:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\hat{F})=ir\Delta\phi+\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda F(K)).$$

Here we note that Δ is the complex Laplacian on functions, defined by $\Delta:=g^{j\bar{k}}\partial_j\partial_{\bar{k}}$, which is not equal to the standard Levi-Civita Laplace-Beltrami operator since we are on a non-Kähler manifolds. However, for our analysis the complex Laplacian works fine. Now because the conformal factor does not affect $\theta^\dagger$, this implies

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta)=ir\Delta\phi+\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda F_\theta(K))$$

We want to choose ϕ so that $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta - \mu(E)I) = 0$, and this will be true if $\Delta\phi = \frac{i}{r}Tr(\Lambda F_\theta(K) - \mu(E)I)$. By Corollary 1.2.9 in [14], we can pick such a ϕ as as long as:

$$\int_X \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda F_\theta(K) - \mu(E)I)\,\omega^n = 0,$$

which we know holds by the definition of slope. Now pick H_0 as the initial metric on E, and let H be the evolving metric along (3.4). We can compute:

$$\partial_t(\log\det h) = \mathrm{Tr}(h^{-1}\dot{h}) = -\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I).$$

Now at time t=0 we have $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta - \mu(E)I) = 0$. And we also saw

$$\partial_t\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda F_\theta - \mu I) = \Delta\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda F_t - \mu I).$$

So by the maximum principle $\partial_t(\log\det h) = 0$ for all time t. Since at time $t = 0$ we have $\log\det h = \log\det I = 0$, this implies $\log\det h = 0$ for all t. □

From this point on, H_0 will always be the initial fixed metric on E satisfying Lemma 3, and H will denote the metric on E evolving by the flow.

3.1 The Donaldson functional

In this subsection we consider the Donaldson functional. Now, in the Kähler and semi-Kähler cases, the Donaldson heat flow is the gradient flow of this functional. If g is only Gauduchon, then it is not even clear that the functional decreases along the flow. However, even in this case the functional plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 1, so we take the time to introduce it here.

Recall we have a fixed metric H_0 on E. Consider the space of positive definite Hermitian endomorphisms, denoted $Herm^+(E)$. For any other metric H on E, as before we define $h \in Herm^+(E)$ by $h = H_0^{-1}H$, and since h is positive definite it can be expressed as $h = e^s$ for some endomorphism s. Now, consider the path in $Herm^+(E)$ connecting I to h given by $h_u = e^{u\cdot s}$ for $u \in [0,1]$, and let $F_{\theta,u}$ be defined using the metric $H_u = H_0 h_u$. We now define the Donaldson functional:

$$M(H_0, H) = \int_0^1\int_X \mathrm{Tr}(F_{\theta,u}s)\,\omega^{n-1}du - \mu(E)\int_X \log\det(h_1)\omega^n. \tag{3.8}$$

Here we note that this definition is slightly different to the usual definition in the Kähler case, in that we chose a specific path connecting I to h, instead of allowing any path. We do this because unlike in the Kähler case, if g is Gauduchon then $M(H_0, H)$ is not path independent. Our specific path was chosen to make certain computations easier in later sections. Now, if g is semi-Kähler then $M(H_0, H)$ is indeed path independent. For details we direct the reader to [19], and note that the proof carries over to the semi-Kähler case precisely because we are able to integrate by parts without creating torsion terms.

Let $H = H(t)$ be a path of metrics on E, and let $M(t) := M(H_0, H(t))$ denote the Donaldson functional evolving with time. We have the following proposition:

Proposition 1. *If the metric on X is semi-Kähler then*

$$\partial_t M(t) = \int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)h^{-1}\dot{h})\,\omega^n.$$

Thus along the Donaldson heat flow $M(t)$ is non-increasing, and at a critical point of M the metric satisfies the Hermitian-Einstein equation.

Proof. The proof of the proposition follows easily from the fact that $M(H_0, H)$ path independent of semi-Kähler manifolds. $\square$

We compute the derivative of $M(t)$ in the Gauduchon case in the next section, as it is an integral part of the proof of Step 1.

4 Convergence properties of the flow

As stated in the introduction, the goal of this section is to prove the Theorem 1, under the assumption that along the Donaldson heat flow the function $\mathrm{Tr}(h)$ is bounded in C^0 independent of time. Since our initial metric H_0 was chosen so that $\det(h) = 1$, the bound on $\mathrm{Tr}(h)$ implies every eigenvalue λ_i of h satisfies $0 < c \leq \lambda_i \leq C$ uniformly. Here we also note that long time existence of the flow, first proven by Donaldson in [7], carries over with no changes in the proof to the non-Kähler setting.

Consider the following proposition:

Proposition 2. *Under the assumption that $||\mathrm{Tr}(h)||_{C^0} \leq C$, we have $||D'hh^{-1}||_{C^0} \leq C$ independent of time.*

The proof of the proposition consists of several local computations and an application of the maximum principle. Because it does not make use of the global structure of X, the proof for g Gauduchon is exactly the same as in the Kähler case. We direct the reader to [15] for details.

Proposition 3. *Under the assumption that $||\mathrm{Tr}(h)||_{C^0} \leq C$, we have the following L^p bound on the full curvature tensor F_θ, which holds for any $1 \leq p < \infty$:*

$$||F_\theta||_{L^p} < C.$$

Proof. Recall from Section 3 that

$$\begin{aligned}(F_\theta)_{\bar{k}j} - (\hat{F}_\theta)_{\bar{k}j} &= -D''_{\bar{k}}(h^{-1}\hat{D}'_j h) \\ &= -h^{-1}D''_{\bar{k}}\hat{D}'_j h + h^{-1}D''_{\bar{k}}hh^{-1}\hat{D}'_j h.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\hat{\Delta}_D h = h(\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta - \Lambda F_\theta) + g^{j\bar{k}}D''_{\bar{k}}hh^{-1}\hat{D}'_j h.$$

From here we see the right hand side is uniformly bounded in C^0, which imples $||\hat{\Delta}_D h||_{C^0} < C$. By standard L^p theory of elliptic PDE's, it follows that for any $1 \leq p < \infty$ we have

$$||h||_{W^{2,p}} < \infty.$$

Since the curvature F is given by a formula involving two derivatives of h, we have the desired result. □

Our next goal is to show that along the Donaldson heat flow, $\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I$ goes to zero strongly in L^2 as t goes to infinity. First we need a lemma bounding the Donaldson functional above and below.

Lemma 4. *Assume the bound* $||\mathrm{Tr}(h)||_{C^0} \leq C$ *holds uniformly in time along the Donaldson heat flow. Then the Donaldson functional* $M(t)$ *is uniformly bounded from above and below along the flow.*

Proof. Recall H_0 was chosen so that $\det(h) = 1$, which implies the second term in the definition of the Donaldson functional (3.8) vanishes. Thus along the flow we have:

$$M(t) = \int_0^1 \int_X \mathrm{Tr}(F_{\theta,u}\, s)\, \omega^{n-1}\, du$$

Since s =log(h), and all the eigenvalues of h are uniformly bounded from above and away from zero, we know s is bounded in C^0. The lemma now follows from the L^p bound on the curvature F_θ.

□

We can now prove L^2 convergence:

Proposition 4. *Along the Donaldson heat flow, for any* $\epsilon > 0$ *there exists a time* T *so that for* $t > T$ *we have:*

$$||\Lambda F_\theta(t) - \mu(E)I||^2_{L^2} < \epsilon.$$

Proof. If the metric g on X is at least semi-Kähler, then this lemma follows easily. As we saw in Proposition 1, in this case $M(t)$ is constructed so that

$$\partial_t M(t) = \int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)h^{-1}\dot{h})\omega^n.$$

Thus along the flow $\partial_t M(t) \leq 0$. Using the semi-Kähler assumption once more, we can integrate by parts to see:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t^2 M(t) &= -2\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)\Delta_D(\Lambda F))\omega^n \\ &= 2\int_X |D'(\Lambda F)|^2 \omega^n \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now the fact that M is non-increasing, convex, and bounded below implies $\partial_t M(t) \longrightarrow 0$ as t approaches infinity, which gives the desired result. Now, if g is only Gauduchon, then the preceding argument does not work, and more delicate analysis needs to be done. First we introduce the following lemma:

Lemma 5. *If g is Gauduchon, then the derivative of the Donaldson functional along any path $H(t)$ is given by:*

$$\dot{M}(t) = \int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)h^{-1}\dot{h})\omega^n - \int_0^1 \int_X (\bar{\partial}\,\mathrm{Tr}(sD'(h^{-1}\dot{h})) - \partial\,\mathrm{Tr}(sD''(h^{-1}\dot{h}))) \wedge \omega^{n-1} du$$

First we show how to complete the proposition using this lemma. Define $Y(t) = ||\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I||^2_{L^2}$. The lemma gives that along the Donaldson heat flow we have:

$$\dot{M}(t) = -Y(t) - \int_0^1 \int_X (\bar{\partial}\,\mathrm{Tr}(sD'(\Lambda F_\theta)) - \partial\,\mathrm{Tr}(sD''(\Lambda F_\theta))) \wedge \omega^{n-1} du. \tag{4.9}$$

Our goal is to show the integral $\int_0^\infty Y(t)dt$ is bounded. We concentrate first on the second term on the right hand side. After integrating by parts we have the following bound:

$$\int_0^1 \int_X (g^{j\bar{k}} \mathrm{Tr}(sD'_j(\Lambda F_\theta))\overline{T_k{}^q{}_q} - \mathrm{Tr}(sD''_{\bar{k}}(\Lambda F_\theta))T_j{}^p{}_p)\, \omega^n du \leq C||D'(\Lambda F_\theta)||^2_{L^2}.$$

Here we have used that s is bounded in C^0 and that the torsion terms depend only on the base metric g and are therefore bounded. In fact we can identify $||D'(\Lambda F_\theta)||^2_{L^2}$ as being equal to $\dot{Y}(t)$. We compute as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{Y}(t) &= 2\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)\Delta_D(\Lambda F_\theta))\omega^n \\ &= -2||D'(\Lambda F_\theta)||^2_{L^2} - 2\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)D''_{\bar{k}}(\Lambda F_\theta))g^{j\bar{k}}T_j{}^p{}_p\omega^n. \end{aligned}$$

We need to show the second term on the right equals zero. By Corollary 2 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)^2)(\nabla^j T_j{}^p{}_p + g^{j\bar{k}}T_j{}^m{}_m\overline{T_k{}^p{}_p})\omega^n \\ &= -\int_X \nabla_{\bar{k}} \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)^2)g^{j\bar{k}}T_j{}^p{}_p)\omega^n \\ &= -2\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)D''_{\bar{k}}(\Lambda F_\theta))g^{j\bar{k}}T_j{}^p{}_p\omega^n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\dot{Y}(t) = -2||D'(\Lambda F_\theta)||^2_{L^2}$. This allows us to return to inequality (4.9):

$$\dot{M}(t) \leq -Y(t) + C||D'(\Lambda F_\theta)||^2 = -Y(t) - \frac{C}{2}\dot{Y}(t).$$

Which gives:

$$Y(t) \leq -\dot{M}(t) - C\dot{Y}(t).$$

Now we can integrate from zero to infinity to get:

$$\int_0^\infty Y(t)dt \leq M(0) + C\,Y(0) - \lim_{b\longrightarrow\infty}(M(b) + Y(b)) < \infty.$$

This integral is finite since $M(t)$ is uniformly bounded from below by Lemma 4 and $Y(t)$ is non-negative. The finiteness of this integral, along with the fact that $\dot{Y}(t) = -2||D'(\Lambda F_\theta)||^2_{L^2} \leq 0$, implies $Y(t)$ goes to zero as t goes to infinity. Now, to finish the proof of the proposition, we prove Lemma 5.

We follow the proof of Lemma (3.6) from [12]. Consider the operator $\tilde{d}$ defined by:

$$\tilde{d}f = \partial_t f\,dt + \partial_u f\,du$$

for $f \in Herm^+(E)$. We also define $\phi = \mathrm{Tr}(F_\theta h^{-1}\tilde{d}h)$. Recall that the Donaldson functional M was defined by integrating along the specific path $h_u = e^{u\cdot s}$. Now if we let Δ be the region in $Herm^+(E)$ defined by $0 \leq u \leq 1,\ \ t_0 \leq t \leq t_0 + \delta$, then by Stokes Theorem we have:

$$\int_{\partial\Delta}\phi = \int_\Delta \tilde{d}\phi$$

Noting that $\phi|_{u=0} = 0$, we compute the left hand side:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial\Delta}\phi &= \int_{u=0}^{u=1}\phi|_{t_0} + \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\delta}\phi|_{u=1} - \int_{u=0}^{u=1}\phi|_{t_0+\delta}\\ &= \int_0^1 \mathrm{Tr}(F_\theta s(t_0))dv + \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\delta}\mathrm{Tr}(F_\theta h^{-1}\partial_t h)dt - \int_0^1 \mathrm{Tr}(F_\theta s(t_0+\delta))dv.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating over X, applying Stokes Theorem, and adding appropriate terms to both sides we have:

$$\begin{aligned}&M(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t_0+\delta}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}(F_\theta h^{-1}\dot{h})\,\omega^{n-1}dt - M(t_0+\delta)\\ =\ &\int_X\int_\Delta \tilde{d}\phi\,\omega^{n-1} - \mu(E)\int_X \log\det(h(t_0))\omega^n + \mu(E)\int_X \mathrm{logdet}(h(t_0+\delta))\omega^n.\end{aligned}$$

This allows us compute the derivative of M at t_0:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t M(t_0) &= \lim_{\delta\to 0}\frac{M(t_0+\delta) - M(t_0)}{\delta}\\ &= \int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \mu(E)I)h^{-1}\dot{h})\,\omega^n - \lim_{\delta\to 0}\frac{1}{\delta}\int_X\int_\Delta \tilde{d}\phi\,\omega^{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

So to prove the lemma we need to understand the last term on the right. Using the fact that $\partial_t F_\theta = D''D'(h^{-1}\partial_t h)$, we can follow [12] and [19] to compute:

$$\tilde{d}\phi = -\bar{\partial}\partial\,\mathrm{Tr}(h^{-1}\dot{h}s) + \bar{\partial}\,\mathrm{Tr}(sD'(h^{-1}\dot{h})) - \partial\,\mathrm{Tr}(sD''(h^{-1}\dot{h})).$$

Since, g is Gauduchon, integrating over X kills the $\bar{\partial}\partial$-term, and we have:

$$\int_X \int_\Delta \tilde{d}\phi = \int_X \int_\Delta (\bar{\partial}\operatorname{Tr}(sD'(h^{-1}\dot{h})) - \partial \operatorname{Tr}(sD''(h^{-1}\dot{h})))du \wedge dt\, \omega^{n-1}.$$

Taking the limit as δ goes to zero and dividing by δ reduces the integral over the whole region to the integral over the slice $\{t = t_0\}$. Thus:

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\delta} \int_X \int_\Delta \tilde{d}\phi\, \omega^{n-1} = \int_0^1 \int_X (\bar{\partial}\operatorname{Tr}(sD'(h^{-1}\dot{h})) - \partial \operatorname{Tr}(sD''(h^{-1}\dot{h})))\, \omega^{n-1} du.$$

□

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof. Let t_i be a subsequence of times along the Donaldson heat flow. By Proposition 2 we have $||H(t_i)||_{C^1} \leq C$, so by going to a subsequence (still denoted t_i) we have that $H(t_i)$ converge strongly in C^0 to a limiting metric H_∞. This metric is non-degenerate by the eigenvalue bounds $0 < c \leq \lambda_i \leq C$ independent of time. Equation (4.9) proves a $W^{2,p}$ bound for H, so taking yet another subsequence we have $H(t_i)$ converge weakly in $W^{2,p}$, and the weak limit must be equal to H_∞. By Banach-Alaglu $H_\infty \in W^{2,p}$. This implies the curvature F_θ^∞ of H_∞ is well defined and in L^p. At this point we have

$$(\Lambda F_\theta(t_i) - \mu(E)I) \longrightarrow (\Lambda F_\theta^\infty - \mu(E)I)$$

weakly in L^p as $i \longrightarrow \infty$. Yet, because $\Lambda F_\theta(t_i) - \mu(E)I$ goes to zero strongly in L^2, it follows that $\Lambda F_\theta^\infty - \mu(E)I$ is weakly zero in L^p. Thus $\Lambda F_\theta^\infty = \mu(E)I$ in this weak sense. Now by standard elliptic regularity results H_∞ is in fact smooth and Hermitian-Einstein. □

5 The C^0 bound from stability

In this section we prove $\operatorname{Tr}(h)$ is uniformly bounded in C^0 along the Donaldson heat flow, under the assumptions that g Gauduchon and E is stable. This step is perhaps the most geometrically meaningful, since we have to use the algebraic-geometric condition of stability to prove a uniform bound along a PDE. Simpson proves this bound in the Kähler case in Proposition 5.3 from [18], and we state his proposition here:

Proposition 5. *If E is stable and $h(t) = e^{s(t)}$ evolves by the Donaldson heat flow, then for all time:*

$$\sup_X |s| \leq C_1 + C_2 M(t). \tag{5.10}$$

This proposition is attractive not only because it gives the desired bound on h, but it also gives an explicit lower bound on the Donaldson functional $M(t)$ that does not require existence of any canonical metric. The proof of this proposition carries over to the case where g is semi-Kähler, once again because we are able to integrate by parts. However, in the case that g is Gauduchon, we cannot hope to generalize this result. For even if one could find a proof of (5.10) in this case, it is not clear that $M(t)$ is decreasing along the flow, thus we would not even get a bound on h.

Instead we adapt the C^0 bound from the elliptic approach of Uhlenbeck and Yau, suitably modified to fit our parabolic case. We prove the bound by contradiction, which is the content of the following proposition:

Proposition 6. *Let H_i be a sequence of metrics along the Donaldson heat flow, and set $h_i = H_0^{-1}H_i$, where H_0 is our initial fixed metric on E. Assume that the metric g is Gauduchon and that*

$$M_i := \sup_X \operatorname{Tr}(h_i) \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Set $\tilde h_i = h_i/M_i$. Then we have the following two conclusions:

i) $\tilde h_i$ tends weakly in $L^2_1(E, End(E))$ to a non-trivial endomorphism h_∞, after going to a subsequence;

ii) There exits a subsequence of times t_i so that $\pi := \lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}(I - h_i^\sigma)$ represents a destabilizing coherent sub-Higgs sheaf of E.

We begin by proving *i*). This step is the same as for the elliptic case, yet we include it here for the readers convenience. First we prove L^2_1 bounds for $\tilde h_i^\sigma$, which will then allow us to take a weak limit. For notational simplicity, we suppress the i from h_i. Set $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ to be the inner product on E defined by H_0, and let $\hat D'$ denote the covarient derivative with respect to this fixed metric. As in [14], we consider the following inequality, which holds for $0 < \sigma \leq 1$:

$$g^{j\bar k}\langle h^{-1}\hat D'_j h, \hat D'_k h^\sigma\rangle \geq |h^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}\hat\nabla h^\sigma|^2, \tag{5.11}$$

Next, we will need the following inequality to establish an L^2_1 bound for $\tilde h^\sigma$:

$$\int_X |h^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}\hat D' h^\sigma|^2\,\omega^n \leq C\int_X |h^\sigma|\omega^n. \tag{5.12}$$

We begin by integrating inequality (5.11), followed by integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_X |h^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}\hat D' h^\sigma|^2\,\omega^n &\leq \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(h^{-1}\hat D'_j h \hat D''_{\bar k} h^\sigma) g^{j\bar k}\omega^n \\ &\leq -\int_X \operatorname{Tr}(D''_{\bar k}(h^{-1}\hat D'_j h)h^\sigma)g^{j\bar k}\omega^n - \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(h^{\sigma-1}\hat D'_j h)g^{j\bar k}\overline{T_k{}^p{}_p}\omega^n. \\ &= \int_X \operatorname{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta - \Lambda\hat F_\theta)h^\sigma)g^{j\bar k}\omega^n. \end{aligned}\tag{5.13}$$

In the last line we used the fact that the second term on the right vanishes by Corollary 2:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_X \operatorname{Tr}(h^{\sigma-1}\hat D'_j h)g^{j\bar k}\overline{T_k{}^p{}_p}\omega^n &= \int_X \operatorname{Tr}(\hat D'_j(h^\sigma))g^{j\bar k}\overline{T_k{}^p{}_p}\omega^n \\ &= -\int_X \operatorname{Tr}(h^\sigma)(\nabla^k T_k{}^p{}_p + g^{j\bar k}T_j{}^q{}_q\overline{T_k{}^p{}_p})\omega^n = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Now, using the C^0 bound for ΛF_θ given by (3.7), we see the desired bound (5.12) follows from (5.13). This bound holds independent of i. Up to now we have not considered the normalized endomorphisms $\tilde{h}_i$. However, simply by dividing by M_i, all the previous inequalities will be true for $\tilde{h}_i$. By definition of the normalization we have $\tilde{h} \leq I$, which in turn implies $\tilde{h}^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \geq I$. Thus it follows that:

$$\int_X |\hat{D}'\tilde{h}^\sigma|^2\omega^n \leq \int_X |\tilde{h}^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}\hat{D}'\tilde{h}^\sigma|^2\omega^n \leq C\int_X |\tilde{h}^\sigma|\omega^n \leq C\int_X \omega^n \leq C,$$

completing the L^2_1 bound for $\tilde{h}^\sigma_i$. Thus, for each σ, there exists a weak limit h^σ_∞ and a subsequence of endomorphisms (still denoted $\tilde{h}^\sigma_i$) that converges weakly in L^2_1 to h^σ_∞. Choose a sequence $\sigma_i \longrightarrow 0$. Now, following a diagonalization argument, we can assume that a single subsequence $\tilde{h}^\sigma_i$ converges for all σ_i.

Next, we show that the limit metric h_∞ is not completely degenerate. To do so we need to the following lemma:

Lemma 6. *Along the Donaldson heat flow, the following inequality holds uniformly in i:*

$$\sup_X \operatorname{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i) \leq C||\tilde{h}_i||_{L^1}.$$

This lemma requires a Green's function argument, along with the fact that ΛF_θ is uniformly bounded in time. In [18] Simpson proves an inequality similar to:

$$\Delta\log\operatorname{Tr}(h) \geq -C(|\Lambda F_\theta| + |\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta|),$$

which involves a local computation and thus holds in the non-Kähler setting. From this inequality the Green's function argument in Lemma 4.2 from [22] carries over to our case. Using the lemma, by definition of the normalization we have:

$$1 = \sup_X \operatorname{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i) \leq C||\tilde{h}_i||_{L^1} \leq C||\tilde{h}_i||_{L^2}\cdot vol(X).$$

Which implies:

$$||\tilde{h}_i||_{L^2} \geq \frac{1}{C} > 0.$$

Thus the limit metric h_∞ is not completely degenerate. This proves *i*) from Proposition 6. We now turn our attention to *ii*), which requires us to prove the the endomorphism π is a weakly holomorphic sub-Higgs bundle. We say π is a weakly holomorphic sub-Higgs bundle if $\pi^* = \pi$, $\pi^2 = \pi$ and $(I-\pi)D''\pi = 0$ in L^1. For a proof of these three fact, we direct the reader to [14], as the result carries over directly to our case.

We now invoke the following theorem of Uhlenback and Yau from [21]:

Theorem 2. *Given a weakly holomorphic subbundle π of E, there exists a coherent subsheaf $\mathcal{F}$ of E, and an analytic subset $S \subset X$ with the following properties:*

i) $codim_X S \geq 2$
ii) $\pi|_{X\setminus S}$ is $\mathbf{C}^\infty$ and satisfies both $\pi^* = \pi = \pi^2$ and $(I-\pi)\bar\partial\pi = 0$
iii) $\mathcal{F}' := \mathcal{F}|_{X\setminus S}$ is a holomorphic subbundle.

The condition that $(I-\pi)D''\pi=0$ implies both $(I-\pi)\bar{\partial}\pi=0$, which allows us to invoke Theorem 2, and $(I-\pi)\theta\pi=0$, which shows that in fact our limiting sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ is a sub-Higgs sheaf of E. Thus, using this theorem, in order to finish Proposition 6 we must show $\mathcal{F}$ is proper and destabilizing. We first show $\mathcal{F}$ is a proper subsheaf of E.

Since $\tilde{h}_i$ converge strongly in L^2 to $h_\infty \neq 0$ almost everwhere, we know h_∞ has a strictly positive eigenvalue. Thus almost everywhere h^0_∞ has at least one nonzero eigenvalue, and hence $rk\,(h^0_\infty)\geq 1$. This implies:

$$rk(\mathcal{F})=rk(\pi)=rk\,(I-h^0_\infty)\leq r-1.$$

On the other hand, since $\det(h(t))=1$ along the Donaldson heat flow, because we are assuming that $\sup_X \mathrm{Tr}(h)$ goes to ∞ we must have an eigenvalue of h that goes to zero. Thus almost everywhere h_∞ has an eigenvalue equal to zero, which implies $rk(\mathcal{F})>0$. So $\mathcal{F}$ is indeed a proper subsheaf of E.

We now prove the $\mathcal{F}$ is destabilizing, thus we have to show the inequality $\mu(\mathcal{F})\geq\mu(E)$. Recall from section 2.1 the Chern-Weil formula, which we apply using the fixed connection associated to H_0:

$$\mu(\mathcal{F})=\frac{1}{rk(\mathcal{F})}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}(\pi\hat{F}_\theta)\wedge\omega^{n-1}-||\hat{D}'\pi||^2_{L^2}.$$

We modify the formula slightly to include $\mu(E)$:

$$\mu(\mathcal{F})=\frac{1}{rk(\mathcal{F})}\left(\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)\circ\pi)\,\omega^n-|\hat{D}'\pi||^2_{L^2}\right)+\mu(E).$$

Thus to show $\mu(\mathcal{F})\geq\mu(E)$, we must verify:

$$\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\tilde{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)\circ\pi)\omega^n\geq||\hat{D}'\pi||^2_{L^2}.$$

Now, by definition π is given by the following L^2 limit $\pi=\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}(I-\tilde{h}^\sigma_i)$, and we have $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)=0$ (from the proof of Lemma 3). Thus it follows that:

$$\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)\circ\pi)\omega^n=-\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)\circ\tilde{h}^\sigma_i)\omega^n \tag{5.14}$$

At this point we use introduce the evolving curvature ΛF_θ using equality (3.6):

$$-\mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)Id)\circ\tilde{h}^\sigma_i)\;=\;-g^{j\bar{k}}\,\mathrm{Tr}(D''_{\bar{k}}(\tilde{h}_i^{-1}\hat{D}'_j\tilde{h}_i)\,\tilde{h}^\sigma_i)-\mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta(t_i)-\mu(E)I)\circ\tilde{h}^\sigma_i).$$

This next step is where our proof differs from the elliptic case. Because h is evolving along the Donaldson heat flow we have $-\mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta(t_i)-\mu(E)I)\circ\tilde{h}^\sigma_i)=\mathrm{Tr}((h_i^{-1}\dot{h}_i)\circ\tilde{h}^\sigma_i)$. We show we can choose a subsequence (still denoted $\tilde{h}^\sigma_i$), so that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}(h_i^{-1}\dot{h}_i\tilde{h}^\sigma_i))\omega^n=0. \tag{5.15}$$

Notice that:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(h_i^{-1}\dot{h}_i\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})) = \mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{-1}\partial_t\tilde{h}_i\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma}) = \mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma-1}\partial_t\tilde{h}_i) = \frac{1}{\sigma}\partial_t\,\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma}).$$

Also, by inequality (3.7), we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_X |\partial_t\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})|\omega^n &\leq \int_X |\mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda F_\theta(t_i) - \mu(E)I)\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})|\omega^n \\ &\leq C\int_X |\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})|\omega^n \leq C,\end{aligned}$$

so by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem we can take limits and derivatives in and out of the integral sign. We define the function $f : \mathbf{R}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{\sigma}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}(t)^{\sigma})\frac{\omega^n}{n!}.$$

Our goal is to show $\dot{f}(t_i)$ goes to zero along a subsequence. The normalization along with the fact that h is positive definite imply $0 \leq f \leq Vol(X)$ for all t. In fact, since $\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma}$ converges strongly in L^2, we have:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} f(t) = \frac{1}{\sigma}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}(h_\infty^{\sigma})\omega^n = C.$$

Thus we can now integrate $\dot{f}$ from zero to infinity:

$$\int_0^\infty \dot{f}\,dt = \lim_{t\to\infty} f(t) - f(0) < \infty.$$

This implies we can pick out a subsequence of times such that $\dot{f}(t_i)$ goes to zero, establishing 5.15 for this subsequence.

Thus along this subsequence we have the following equality:

$$-\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta - \mu(E)I)\circ\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})\omega^n = -\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_X g^{j\bar{k}}\,\mathrm{Tr}(D''_{\bar{k}}(\tilde{h}_i^{-1}\hat{D}'_j\tilde{h}_i)\,\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})\omega^n. \quad (5.16)$$

If we integrate by parts the right hand side becomes:

$$\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}\left(\int_X g^{j\bar{k}}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{-1}\hat{D}_j\tilde{h}_i D''_{\bar{k}}\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})\omega^n + \int_X \mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{-1}D'_j\tilde{h}_i\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})g^{j\bar{k}}\overline{T_k{}^q{}_q}\omega^n\right). \quad (5.17)$$

Note the last term on the right vanishes by of our Gauduchon assumption:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\tilde{h}_i^{-1}\hat{D}'_j\tilde{h}_i)\,\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})g^{j\bar{k}}\overline{T_k{}^q{}_q}\,\omega^n &= \int_X \mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma-1}\hat{D}'_j\tilde{h}_i)g^{j\bar{k}}\overline{T_k{}^q{}_q}\,\omega^n \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma}\int_X \hat{\nabla}_j\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})g^{j\bar{k}}\overline{T_k{}^q{}_q}\,\omega^n \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})(\nabla^{\bar{k}}\overline{T_k{}^q{}_q} + g^{j\bar{k}}T_j{}^p{}_p\overline{T_k{}^q{}_q})\omega^n = 0.\end{aligned}$$

We also estimate the term on the left from (5.17):

$$\begin{aligned}\int_X g^{j\bar{k}}\,\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{h}_i^{-1}\hat{D}'_j\tilde{h}_i D''_{\bar{k}}\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})\,\omega^n &\geq \int_X |\tilde{h}_i^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}\hat{D}'\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma}|^2\,\omega^n \\ &\geq ||\hat{D}'(\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})||^2_{L^2} = ||\hat{D}'(I-\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})||^2_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this last inequality with (5.17) and (5.16) gives:

$$\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}||\hat{D}'(I-\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})||^2_{L^2} \leq -\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)\circ\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})\omega^n.$$

Thus we can conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}||\hat{D}'\pi||^2_{L^2} &= \lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}(\hat{D}'\pi,\hat{D}'(I-\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma}))_{L^2} \\ &\leq \lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}||\hat{D}'\pi||_{L^2}||\hat{D}'(I-\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})||_{L^2} \\ &\leq ||\hat{D}'\pi||_{L^2}\left(-\lim_{\sigma\to 0}\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)\circ\tilde{h}_i^{\sigma})\omega^n\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq ||\hat{D}'\pi||_{L^2}\left(\int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)\circ\pi)\omega^n\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used 5.14. This gives the desired inequality:

$$||\hat{D}'\pi||^2_{L^2} \leq \int_X \mathrm{Tr}((\Lambda\hat{F}_\theta-\mu(E)I)\circ\pi)\omega^n,$$

and thus proves $\mathcal{F}$ is destabilizing. Even though we only constructed a destabilizing subsheaf along a subsequence (since we only proved (5.15) for a subsequence), we did this by assuming that $\mathrm{Tr}(h_i)$ goes to infinity. Thus, if E is indeed stable we must have that $\mathrm{Tr}(h_i)$ is bounded for all subsequences along the Donaldson heat flow. This proves Proposition 6 and as a result Theorem 1.

Just as in [18], as a corollary we get the following Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality:

Corollary 3. *Suppose E is a stable Higgs bundle on X such that $\bar{\partial}\theta = \theta\wedge\theta = 0$. Then*

$$\left(2r\,c_2(E)-(r-1)c_1(E)^2\right)[\omega]^{n-2}\geq 0.$$

References

[1] Bando, S. and Y.-T. Siu, "Stable sheaves and Einstein-Hermitian metrics," Geometry and Analysis on Complex Manifolds, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ (1994), 39-50.

[2] Biswas, I., "Stable Higgs bundles on compact Gauduchon manifolds," C.R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **349** (2011), no. 1-2, 71-74.

[3] Buchdahl, N.P., "Hermitian-Einstein connections and stable vector bundles over compact complex surfaces," Math. Ann., **280** (1988), no. 4, 625-684.

[4] Corlette, K., 'Flat G-bundles with canonical metrics," J. Differential Geom. **28** (1988), no. 3, 361-382

[5] Corlette, K., "Nonabelian Hodge theory," Proce. Sympos. Pure Math., **54** part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (1993)

[6] Diederich, K., and T. Ohsawa, 'Harmonic mappings and disc bundles over compact Kähler manifolds," Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **21** (1985), 819-833.

[7] Donaldson, S.K., "Anti self-dual Yang-Mills connections over complex angebraic surfaces and stable vector bundles," Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **50** (1985), 1-26.

[8] Donaldson, S.K., "Infinite determinants, stable bundles, and curvature," Duke Math. J. **54** (1987), 231-247.

[9] Donaldson, S.K., "Twisted harmonic maps and the self-duality equations," Proc. London Math. Soc. **55** (1987), 127-131.

[10] Jacob, A., "Existence of approximate Hermitian-Einstein structures on semi-stable bundles," arXiv:1012.1888v1, [math.DG].

[11] Griffiths, P. and J. Harris, "Principles of Algebraic Geometry", John Wiley & Sons, (1978).

[12] Kobayashi, S., "Differential geometry of complex vector bundles," Publications of the Mathematical Society of Japan, **15**. Kanô Memorial Lectures, **5**. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (1987).

[13] Li, J. and S.-T. Yau, "Hermitian-Yang-Mills connections on non-Kähler manifolds," Mathematical aspects of string theory (San Diego, Calif., 1986), 560-573, World Sci. Publishing, Singapore, (1987).

[14] Lübke, M. and A. Teleman, "The Kobayashi-Hitchin correspondence," World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ (1995).

[15] McFeron, D., "Remarks on some non-linear heat flows in Kähler geometry," Ph.D. Thesis, Columbia University (2009).

[16] Narasimhan, M.S., and C.S. Seshadri, "Stable and unitary bundles on a compact Riemann surface," Math. Ann. **82** (1965), 540-564.

[17] Sampson, J., "Applications of harmonic maps to Kähler geometry," Contemp. Math. no. 49, Amer. Math. Soc., Rovidence, RI (1986), 125-133

[18] Simpson, C., "Constructing variations of Hodge structure using Yang-Mills theory and applications to uniformization," J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), no. 4, 867-918.

[19] Siu, Y.-T., "Lectures on Hermitian-Einstein metrics for stable bundles and Kähler-Einstein metrics," Birkäuser Verlag, Basel, (1987).

[20] Siu, Y.-T., "The complex analyticity of harmonic maps and the strong rigity of compact Kähler manifolds," Ann. of Math, (2) **112** (1980), 73-112.

[21] Uhlenbeck, K., and S.-T. Yau, "On the existence of Hermitian-Yang-Mills connections in stable vector bundles," Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. **39-S** (1986), 257-293.

[22] Weinkove, B., "Singularity formation in the Yang-Mills flow," Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations. **19**, no. 2, (2004), 211-220.

Department of Mathematics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027
e-mail: ajacob@math.columbia.edu